

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. Claims 1-3 and 5-17 remain pending in this application. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

The specification has been amended as recommended by the Examiner. Support for the amendments to the specification is present in the specification at paragraph 23, where the orifices as the “flow-restricting action of orifices 42.” Accordingly, any passage communicating oil to a flow restricting orifice would necessarily need to be larger than that orifice. Applicant has amended the specification to further clarify this claimed feature. Support for these amendments is present in Figures 1, 3 and 4 and paragraph 23 discussed above.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, and 9-13 as the proposed combination of ETO (U.S. 5,411,385) with Libis (U.S. 4,173,440) does not disclose or suggest all of the claimed features. The Examiner argues that Eto discloses all the claimed features except for the inlet and outlet orifices including a smaller flow area than the flow passages, but that Libis discloses this feature.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. No reference numeral or any other citation is provided for the features argued disclosed by Libis, except for referring Applicant to Figure 2. Libis disclose a compressor with a lubricating system that utilizes valves V1, V2 and V3 to selectively receive lubricant through different passages at different pressures based on operating conditions (Col 1, lines 50-60). This does not disclose or suggests orifices at each of the inlet and outlet bearing that includes a smaller flow area than the flow passage. The valves do not provide a restriction; they merely provide an on/off function without restricting flow (Please see Col 4, lines 5-42). The Libis device accommodates the different oil pressure requirements for different operating conditions by selectively opening and closing main and secondary oil passages. This operation does not disclose the claimed features and certainly does not suggest the claimed orifice configuration.

For at least this reason, the proposed combination is not supported as all the claimed features are not disclosed or suggested. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected as being obvious over the above proposed combination and further in view of Williams (U.S. 3,260,444). Further, claims 15, 16 and 17 were separately

rejected as being obvious in view of Eto and Libis. Each of these claims depends from an allowable base claim and is therefore also in allowable form.

Accordingly, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 03-0835, in the name of Carrier Corporation, for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: May 14, 2008